

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	э.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/545,554	-	04/07/2000	Richard B. Hook	13DV13349	1804	
29399	7590	7590 12/17/2004		EXAMINER		
JOHN S. BEULICK			KIM, TAE JUN			
C/O ARM	STRONG T	TEASDALE LLP				
ONE MET	TROPOLIT	'AN SQUARE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 2600			3746			
ST LOUIS	S MO 63	102-2740				

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	•
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/545,554	HOOK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ted Kim	3746
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti- oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 S	September 2004.	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ∑ Thi	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		•
4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-20 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	er. cepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicatority documents have been received in Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/545,554 Page 2

Art Unit: 3746

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/20/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling et al (5,630,319) in view of Briesch (5,564,269). Schilling teaches a combustor having 3 domes 61, 63, 65 and incorporating dual fuel premixers in each dome, i.e. of the type utilized by Joshi et al 5,351,477, which is incorporated by reference (see col. 3, 1st few lines) and hence operate fuel lean, i.e. operate with a fuel/air mixture equivalence ratio of less than one (see

Page 3

Art Unit: 3746

col. 6, lines 4+ of Joshi et al 5,351,477). Schilling does not teach water injection into the premixers. Briesch teaches a water/steam injection system that injects steam 88 into the air from compressor 6 prior to injection into the combustor in order to increase the power output and reduce NOx emissions (col. 7, lines 27+). Such a combination of Briesch with Schilling/Joshi will result in the steam mixing with the compressed air upstream of the premixers of Schilling/Joshi and entering the centerbody 49 via passage 51 and then entering the combustor via 51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a water/steam injection system as taught by Briesch, in order to order to further increase the power output and/or NOx emissions.

- 4. Claims 5, 12-14, 18-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling et al (5,630,319) in view of Briesch (5,564,269), as applied above, and further in view of Talabisco et al (5,357,741). The prior art teach various aspects of applicant's claimed invention but do not explicitly teach the water delivery system operable in first and second mode relative to a predetermined value. Talabisco et al teach that it is old and well known in the art to control the steam/water based on the load, among other variables (see abstract and see col. 6, lines 62-68).
 - FIG. 2 is a graph that shows the steam-to-fuel ratio as a function of turbine firing temperature (T_5) for a given relative humidity, fuel gas composition and ambient temperature (100.degree. F.). The graph further shows that the steam-to-fuel ratio is a linear function of load since load can be directly correlated to turbine firing temperature T_5 . (see (col. 6, lines 62-68).

Application/Control Number: 09/545,554 Page 4

Art Unit: 3746

This citation specifically teaches that when the load increases, the steam increases with the load¹, and hence any arbitrary point, including the 90% load point, can be considered the predetermined point for the sake of the claims for which the 2nd mode of operation is in effect. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to control the steam/water injection by using a first and second mode with a predetermined value, as taught by Talabisco et al, as being a notoriously old and well known method utilized in the art for controlling the water injection. As for the set point being greater than 90 percent of the rated power capability, that is within the ordinary skill in the art, as an obvious matter of finding the workable ranges in the art. Furthermore, for claim 5, all that is required is that water be injected at greater than 90% of the load. At near full load, that is when the temperatures are highest, as shown in Fig. 2 of Talabisco et al, and water injection most needed for its temperature reduction and NOx reduction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ water injection at loads greater than 90% to reduce the temperature and NOx levels of Schilling et al.

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's amendments to the claims have required new ground(s) of rejection as above.

Contact Information

¹ Note that the steam/fuel ratio is increasing with the load (temperature) and the fuel is also increasing with the load (temperature) due to thermodynamics. Hence, the steam is increasing with respect to the load, in order for the

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Ted Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-4829. The Examiner can be reached on regular business hours before 5:00 pm, Monday to Thursday and every other Friday.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are 703-872-9306 for Regular faxes and 703-872-9306 for After Final faxes.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler, can be reached on 571-272-4834.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist of Technology Center 3700, whose telephone number is 703-308-0861. General inquiries can also be directed to the Patents Assistance Center whose telephone number is 800-786-9199. Furthermore, a variety of online resources are available at http://www.uspto.gov/main/patents.htm

<u> 1011 </u>						
Ted Kim	Telephone	571-272-4829				
Primary Examiner	Fax (Regular)	703-872-9306				
December 10, 2004	Fax (After Final)	703-872-9306				
Technology Center 3700 Receptionist	Telephone	703-308-0861				
Patents Assistance Center	Telephone	800-786-9199				